

170
IX. Throwing stones from glass houses

Particularly because Posner's book is so arrogantly mistitled from time to time while reading it I was rather taken by its ^{extensive} overt dishonesty. At some points it is rather brazen. Thinking about it and the possible risk of exposure and embarrassment I came to believe that he and his publisher depended on the record of the ^{unquestioning} major media, of support of the ^{official} mythology whatever the offense of the government or its apologists, and on Posner's ability to refuse ^{any} confrontation with any who really knew what the evidence is. He knew that because travel poses hazards I do not travel and am never out of Frederick except when driven to the Johns Hopkins hospital in Baltimore for medical appointments. He thus knew I would not be in any TV studio to face him and because I would not I also could not challenge him.

One of these point in Posner's book that took my attention immediately is where he writes his version of Oswald's literature distribution in New Orleans. (Page 127) Throughout Posner's argument is that Oswald was always all alone in what he did. He also pretends that all identifications of Oswald were always positive, firm identifications. The indications in the official records first available, in the Commission's published twenty-six volumes Posner boasts ^{reading and then} about ^{first} indexing himself, an obviously false and impossible claim, and in the Commission's records ^{first} (available at the Archives, are that Oswald was not that much of a loner. For this reason and because ^{of} the ^{in them} many leads to a possible associate that were ignored in the official investigations, one of the larger files I established for ^{study and} later inquiry was on Oswald's literature distribution. When I ^{just worked} ~~was~~ later was working in New Orleans I followed up on the one that ^{his} in writing about ^{it} Posner at the very least cut some factual and ethical corners; ~~in writing~~:

"On Wednesday, May 29 (1963), he went to the Jones Printing Company, opposite the side entrance of the ^{Lee} Reily company (where Oswald worked briefly). Using the name/Osborne, he ~~entered~~ said he needed a thousand handbills. He handed the receptionist an 8-by-10 inch sheet of paper on which he had written:" and then followed ^a the copy for that handbill. Posner has no ~~positive~~ source reference on the words quoted but he does at the end of his ^{quotation} reproduction of what that handbill was to say and did say. When I checked

I found what I expected. His citation is to ~~XXXX~~ an FBI report of an interview with Mrs. Myra Silver. (XXIIH796-8) Whatever his reason Posner refers to her as the "receptionist." That is a rather ^{description of} ~~imposing~~ ^{reference to} Douglas Jones' small operation. The FBI report Posner cites refers to her as the company's "secretary." She was that and in general, she was Jones' assistant.

But what Posner does not say in saying the exact opposite is that Mrs. Silver did not identify Oswald as the man who brought that job in and later picked it up. What this report actually says (^{on} ~~an~~ Page ~~796~~ 797) is, "MRS. SILVER ~~was~~ was shown a photograph of LEE HARVEY OSWALD, at which time she stated she could not recognize the person represented in the picture as the person who placed the order for the handbills."

This is not at all what Posner writes. He is unequivocal in saying that "Osborne," ~~He gives no other reason for saying that Oswald and would alone picked those handbills up.~~ who had the work done, was Oswald. Posner once again simply was brazenly untruthful.

Any real examination of those FBI records that were in the Commission's volumes ⁱⁿ and its files at the Archives discloses ^{immediately} ~~fairly early in examination~~ that the FBI had its own party line, that its agents knew what that line was and that to the degree possible they heaved to it. Many of the ~~first~~ records first available reflect this in understatements, evasive statements or circumlocutions. New Orleans FBI Agent John M. McCarthy's words are a bit artificial and they are angled to ~~say~~ say what clearly is not what Mrs. Silver told him. His question and her answer are in terms of her identifying Oswald or not identifying him. McCarthy's words leave this open in saying she "could" not identify Oswald. *In fact she did not.*

At the Archives I followed this up and sure enough, there were additional FBI interviews the ~~Commis~~ Commission did not publish.

Posner is lavish in his praise for the Archives "In obtaining (documents" from it through its "excellent staff," of which he then single ^(page 501) ~~two~~ out in particular. If Posner, demon investigator and "Wall Street ^Wayer" that he is, had had the slightest interest in more about ^{unknown} learning the obvious, that Oswald had at least one associate in his literature operation in New Orleans, he would have asked the Archives for copies of any other records relating to this printing, any filed under Jones, Douglas, Printing, and he would have gotten them.

From the language of the published FBI report this is an obvious need in any honest investigation. But Posner's was never honest. ^{He} ~~he~~ began with his revision of the line of the official apologists, modified by the House assassins committee's report, that although it did everything wrong the Commission nonetheless came up with the right answer. Posner could not ^{a look} get away with saying this if he permitted himself minimal honesty.

He as up to that challenge.

If Posner had asked for any other ~~the~~ records he would have gotten what he did not want, Jones confirming Silver that it was not Oswald. I did get that additional information ^{at the archives.} It was never withheld.

On my second trip to New Orleans, the first after I testified to the grand jury, my first interest was in checking out the FBI's reason for its odd language in ~~saying~~ ^{to intend to evade} the unequivocal response it got from ~~her~~ ^{both and Jones.} Silver. That turned out to be true. When I was there she as not but Jones was absolutely firm first in stating that without any question at all it was not Oswald and then in selecting ~~some pictures in a parti-~~ ~~cular~~ several pictures of one man as most closely resembling the man who did pick those handbills up. It is the picture of a former Marines mate of Oswald!

In this regard, because Posner saw or pretends he saw no significance in the use of the name "Osborne," Osborne was a Marine mate of both Oswald and the man Jones was clear in identifying. Not being a Posner, I did not ask Jones to make an ~~unequivocal~~ unequivocal identification because four years had passed. I asked him only to see if he could select a picture of the man who most closely ~~as~~ resembled the man who had picked that small printing job up. He selected four different pictures of that one man, even one in which he had a lush beard ^{although} when he was beardless in the other three.

Here I believe that some explanations are in order. First, when Garrison's staff knew I was going to see Jones, ^{his} the chief investigator, Louis Ivan, asked if I would take "Bill Bowley" with me. He said that if I would he would provide a car and ~~river~~ driver. When Ivan asked and I told him I did not intend to tape the interview, he asked me to type it. He loaned me ^{an office} a tape recorder and I returned with ~~the~~ Jones' ^{positive} ~~position~~ statement that the real Oswald did not pick that job up. There were in the file of pictures I showed

^{only} ~~him~~ several of Oswald. One was the oft-printed ~~on of the~~ New Orleans police ^{mug shot} photograph taken when he was ^e arrested there in August, 1963. I picked that one out in particular, asked Jones about it, he smiled, obviously recognizing Oswald, and nodding his head negatively, said, "Not him."

"Bill Boxley" was and never hid the fact that he was William Woods. ^{He} also did not hide the fact that he had worked for the CIA and had been fired for chronic alcoholism. Garrison had hired him paying him from private funds, ^{opportunity of} over the vigorous ~~resistance to~~ his regular staff, particularly ^{of three of} his lawyer assistants, ~~three in particular~~. I spent much time there and there is no question in my mind that rather than serving the CIA in secret, Garrison's later concoction when he fired Boxley, Boxley was overly- dedicated to Garrison. He and Garrison could also converse about what was strange to the professional police investigators ^{Garrison} he had, all city policemen detailed to his office. Boxley and the education they lacked.

When we returned I told Ivon that Jones had been firm in stating that Oswald did not pick that job ~~an~~ up and equally firm in his identification of the man he said did. I gave Ivon that name. He was surprised. But Boxley insisted that ^{none} ~~any~~ of this had transpired. That really stunned me and thenceforth I placed no trust in Boxley or ⁱⁿ anything he said. My response was to go to the ~~ice~~ office in which Ivon had let me use a desk and return with the tape. I had intended to transcribe only two portions of it, the negative identification of Oswald and the positive identification of the other man. I played the tape for Ivon, he ^{looked} at Boxley quizzically, and he asked me to lend him the tape,

When I asked for it the next day it could not be found. I have ~~to~~ no reason to believe ^{at} Ivon deep-sixed it.

Not long thereafter Jones' place of business and others in the area were taken over for demolition so that a large federal enclave could be constructed in that area. Jones became a salesman for another printing company.

On a later trip I asked Andrew Sciambra, known as "Moo," the ^{youngest} staff lawyer and the one who spent most time with Garrison, if he would like to go with me ^{when} ~~interviewed~~ I ~~tried to get from statements from~~ Jones and ~~Mr.~~ Silver. He not only said he would,

like that, he arranged for it and drove us both there. ~~Mr.~~ Silver had arranged for Jones to be at her home at the time ~~so~~ for which she invited us. ~~His~~ ^{to} her home. This time I used my own tape recorder and I kept the tape. My sole interest was in having each look at the same pictures I had shown Jones, about a hundred or so miscellaneous pictures from all over the country, almost all of ~~me~~ ^{which} I did not know. They ~~saw~~ ^{examined} the pictures independently. That is, neither could see the pictures the other identified. When both had examined them and I showed both together the pictures they had selected independently, they agreed that those were the pictures they had selected and Jones confirmed that they were the pictures he has selected at his printing plant. Both were relaxed, at ease and open and friendly, as Jones had been when I had interviewed him alone. He then, knowing I was from a distant area, gave me his business card in the event I wanted to get in touch with him again.

Jones was one of the victims of Hurricane Camille when it struck Long Beach, Mississippi when he was there. (New Orleans States-Item August 21, 1969) He then, aside from working for another printing company, was also secretary of the ^{State} printing-industry organization for the State.

Now for the beginning of the idiocy of those who invent conspiracy theories and then regard and wrote about them as "solutions," & phobias not as apparent in those early years as it was to become.

When Jones has selected those different pictures of the man he did not know as the one who had picked the handbills up, ~~after he had printed them and I knew, of course, who~~ that ~~man~~ ^{was} man is, the immediate question was could he have been misidentified, did he look enough like Oswald for a mistaken identification. For one thing, they parted their hair on different sides. Then, if ~~a~~ ^{an} mistake and ~~it~~ ^{it} used, it could have been unfair to that man, ~~especially~~ in particular because Garrison already had him charged with perjury, a case he never pursued. ~~So~~ ^{Therefore}, I was afraid to ask any on Garrison's staff to see if the picture of that man could be altered, as by changing the part in the hair and with makeup ~~as for the theater~~ of his face. ~~So~~ ^{So}, I decided to ask a commercial artist who was interested in the ~~assassination~~ ^a to see if he could make ~~that~~ ^{this man} picture of him look like Oswald.

until it was offloaded and taken to the hospital for the so terribly defective autopsy ^{Lifton's} that will forever raise questions about that assassination. When ^{this} book appeared I read it with care. It was immediately apparent that if Lifton was not aware of the fact from the evidence of which he had to know that at each and every essential step in his imagined conspiracy ^{proved it} ~~it was proven~~ to be impossible he had to be irrational. That was a possibility I did not discard, remembering his insistence that assassins, in the plural, were somehow supported ^{ed} and also hidden by those papier mache trees not one of which exists in any of the contemporaneous photographs of that Plaza, papier mache trees that somehow had the strength to hold men invisibly, those fake trees that had been both ^{planted} ~~planted~~ and removed in ^{that} the very busy part of downtown Dallas entirely unseen, ^{tree} ~~and~~ in which those assassins would be secure, not even the urgent calls of nature disturbing them until they, too, also unseen, even thought from the moment of the shooting the plaza was always crowded with mourners many of whom brought and laid out bouquets of flowers, and then in some magical way Lifton did not explain, they found their way into the sewer system/secret tunnels that no longer exist, ^{having} ~~being~~ ^{as magically and} ~~being~~ ^{filled in} as they ^{no} ~~rise~~ ^{were} invisibly ^{as when, in Lifton's imagination, they had been dug}.

Aside from the tape I made of that Lifton phone call ^(and not at all!) this absolute insanity in which at last report he still had faith, he repeated ^{it} to Robert Richert, then of CBS News, who put it in a memo I have, ^{Lifton also wrote} ~~and in writing~~ ^{about it} to Sylvia Meagher. His letters to her are included in the ~~my~~ ^{my} important archive of all her work at Hood College, here in Frederick.

Lifton had an earlier ~~and~~ record with Thornley. They got to know each other when after discharged Thornley lived for a while in the Los Angeles area. Lifton then got Thornley to execute an affidavit in which Thornley swore, under the penalties of perjury, ^{that} ~~that~~ Marine mate when he was with Oswald, John Rene Heindell, from New Orleans, was known as "H. dell," ^{the} ~~the~~ name Oswald sometimes used. That was not true and it was the cause of some embarrassment for Heindell.

So when my innocent request for Newcomb could use his art to exculpate Thornley was known to Lifton, his fertile, uninhibited and ~~rarely~~ ^{rarely} rational imagination saw in this a vast conspiracy focused on his friend ^{the} ~~the~~ Thornley. Even though Newcomb's work failed

That the unthinking typist had typed that short letter on an office letterhead, what she spent her working day doing, was instant proof to Lifton that I was conspiring with Garrison. That ~~would~~ have been like advertising it in the New York Times, using a letterhead if there had been anything devio^{us}/~~d~~afoot, as obviously there was not.

to show
 that Thornley was an Oswald look-alike. What ~~proved~~ ^{showed} that Thornley was not passing himself off as Oswald was the exact opposite to the incredible Lifton mind and mouth.

That Garrison also had no interest ^{was} meaningless to Lifton from the mark of whose mind impossible realities ooze with ~~each impossibility he imagines~~, impossibilities that become real to him on each cooing. *1074 here*

Separate from all this Lifton irrationality there is the fact ~~that~~ ^{that} both Jones and Silver, the only persons who ~~could~~ ^{could} know, other than this mysterious ~~man who it was~~ who picked those handbills up, have been firm in denying that it was or could have been Oswald, ~~separate from which~~ ^{It also} is their common belief that Thornley resembled that man, ~~not~~ ^{who was} not Oswald. ~~Whatever~~ ^{not} they told the FBI, and there is no reason at all to believe that they told the FBI in 1963 other than what they told me in 1967 and 1968, I had the FBI reports that the Commission had ~~and~~ ^{* not the FBI} neither carried on any further investigation in an effort to ~~learn~~ ^{learn} who it was that was associated with the Oswald Posner now insists was entirely alone.

- Having no need to ^{but} never transcribed the tape of that joint interview. But I ~~did~~ ^{my} have memos covering both in my files.

Then, the very afternoon of Posner's appearance on TV in Washington, entirely unrelated to this, George Lardner, the Washington Post's experienced national desk reporter, an excellent reporter who won a 1992 Pulitzer and the reporter who without any question knows more about the assassination and its investigations than any other reporter in the world, ~~phoned~~ ^{my} to ask me if I had a copy of an FBI cable from its Mexico City "legat" dated November 19, 1963. ^{extended} In those countries where the FBI is represented for liaison purposes, ~~sometimes extended into operations~~, its ~~office's~~ ^{is} office's head ~~are~~ ^{is} known as the "Legal Attache." The copy Lardner had was, he believed, too heavily excised by the FBI. I had no recollection ~~of~~ ^{three days before the assassination} of a cable of that date but I had a clear recollection of ~~a similar and~~ ^a possibly related cables ~~to~~ of the day of the assassination and into the early hours on the next morning. Lardner asked me if I could search for and let him have copies of any ~~able to~~ ^{able to} of that time. I told him that I would as soon as someone was here who could do the searching for me.

(Congressional Record, May 30, 1974, Page S 9336)

This, alas, also requires an explanation, of an unusual situation.

In 1975 I suffered the first of a series of venous thromboses, blockades in ^{my leg} the veins. Followed the implantation of an artificial artery in my left thigh in 1980 ^{were} two emergency operations. The second ~~of which~~ ^{survive it} was not expected to survive, added to the limitations on my mobility. As a result of these and other surgeries I have increasing difficulty in using stairs, I am not to stand still other than momentarily and when sitting I am to have my legs elevated. While heart surgery in 1989 was successful, even though my cardiologist did not expect me to ~~survive~~ ^{survive it}, my weakness has increased, ~~as~~ ^{and} has my ability to use stairs. As a result I have only infrequent and then limited access to ~~the~~ records ^{this includes} that are in our basement. ~~All~~ the approximately third of a million once-withheld records I obtain by a series of lawsuits under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Some of those FOIA lawsuits were precedential and one was cited in the legislative history of the Act's ^{of the investigatory files exemption to open} 1974 amending as requiring the amending of FBI, CIA and similar records to FOIA access. ¹⁰⁸⁻⁴

Helen Wilson, a student at Hood College who graduated in May of 1993, had helped me in her spare time. I would then retrieve and make copies for reporters and others who requested them because Helen located and brought those records up and then returned them to the files. When as I infrequently do, I ^{went} ~~gave~~ to the basement for records I need, it tires me excessively. I need to use both hands in climbing the stairs and to carry any records up I use a plastic grocery bag that still permits me to use ^{both} ~~that~~ ^{then} hand ^{on} the handrails ~~along the stairs~~. Lifting more ~~than~~ fifteen pounds has been prohibited since the 1989 heart surgery.

I believe that the ^{meaning} ~~intent~~ of FOIA is that the people have a right to know what their government does and therefore all records not within the exemptions should be available to the people. I therefore believe that any requester is surrogate for the ~~people~~ people and that in a literal sense has no property right to the records obtained but does have the right to the use he or she makes of those record. I therefore have always given all writing ~~in~~ the filed, which in practise ^{means} those who write what I know I will not agree with or have reason to believe I will not, access to all I obtained under FOIA. If I wanted to supervise their uses of the files, and I do not, it would still be in-

possible for me ~~and~~ ^{and} all those who have used my files have always done that with no supervision at all. They likewise are not supervised in their use of our copier to which all have always had access. I take those using the files to the basement, where I have a table, portable typewriter, paper and other supplies for them, show them the location of the various files, show them how if they forget they can learn again, and after answering any questions leave them ~~for them~~ ^{on their own} to work as they see fit.

From time to time the uses of these files are extensive and for periods of time nobody is here to use them. The last intensive ^{of those files by many people,} uses as of this writing ^{was} prior to the twenty-fifth assassination anniversary in 1983 ~~and then~~ when reporters, researchers and TV from coast to coast were here. Among individual users, Harrison Edward Livingstone and Anthony Summers and those working for them made most use following that anniversary. Summers had two college professors who helped him, and Livingstone used a Baltimore city policeman, Richard Waybright, to do ~~almost the~~ the searching and copying for ~~me~~ him.

Lardner's interest in a cable from the Mexico City Legat to FBI Headquarters of ~~the~~ three days before the assassination and related to it, with major excisions in it, reminded me of exchanges of cables ^{morning after} between headquarters and the Dallas field office beginning late at night the ~~day of~~ ^{those cables were} the assassination, ~~actually~~ ^{reduced} dated after midnight. I told him about them to see if he wanted copies of them and about what had been withheld from that cable traffic in my FOIA lawsuit for all Dallas JFK assassination records. (LA 75-0322)

Oswald was known to have been taped in Mexico City. In Posner's account (pages 187-8) with ~~of~~ not atypical source noting, perhaps giving the Washington Post as his source, perhaps Tony Summers, "the Agency may have recorded as many as eight conversations...either on the telephone to the Soviet Embassy or during his visits there."

The night of the assassination, the Legat sent an agent ^{Eldon Ludd, later a Congressman,} whose name I could not recall to Dallas with at least one tape and at least one picture believed to be of Oswald. Dallas FBI Agent Wallace ~~Heitman~~ ^{Love Field}, one of its "subversive" specialists, was sent to meet that plane ~~at Love Field~~. I remember that Heitman had annotated his short memo with the plane's time of arrival and with its Navy identification number. It was an attaché's plane.

Agents in Dallas familiar with Oswald listened to the tape. Dallas ~~sent~~^{cabled} headquarters a paraphrase of as I recall three pages. Headquarters then ordered Dallas to transcribe and ~~rush~~^{was identified but} the transcription to headquarters. This traffic was withheld from me entirely, under the usual catch-all and rarely justified "national security" claim. It was already public, with the CIA's approval, that we did all that bugging and wiretapping there and even that we had a live source include the Cuban consulate. So there was no legitimate "national security" claim. But in the event there had been, what Oswald said does not so qualify and the requirement is that what is "reasonably segregible" is to be disclosed.

Lardner said he is interested and I promised copies as soon as I could have them ^a searched for. But then I got to thinking that with the prolific shysterism in Posner's writing, especially on this point, I ought risk getting overly tired to fetch, copy and send him those records.

One of the many literary shysterism that permeate ^{his} the writing is using unidentified sources or citing ~~none~~ none at all. ^{his} This enables Posner to lie without seeming to lie himself should he be caught at it. This is his Tricky Dickery with regard to the tape, lies that also cover the CIA's ^{as}. And while doing that he make a pretense of being critical of the CIA in his note on the next page. He there says it "is its own worst enemy on many of these issues" by its withholding, nothing new in that, and he then justifies this "as an inherent part of the intelligence trade." That is to slap the CIA's wrist with an imaginary feather. *Fact is the law of the land.*

Meanwhile, all the time he is lustily really covering for the CIA by falsely pretending that ~~the~~ ^{the} tape, at least one, no longer exists. First he quotes a former investigator for the House assassins committee as saying, "I have ~~seen~~^{seen} the cable and all, and guess what happened to the tape - gone!" Next Posner quotes "A retired Agency official familiar with the Oswald file ^(who) spoke to the author on the condition he not be identified." ^{Posner} What he does not tell the reader is that this agency official required the CIA's approval before he spoke to Posner, under the employment contract he signed. So it was in this sense really the CIA that was talking to Posner, ^{Posner} who quotes him as ~~say~~^{saying}, "Even if there ~~had~~^{had} been a sound recording (which implies also that there had never been and if

he was "familiar with the ^SOswald file" he knows its history, recounted above, and thus he lies), it would have been erased routinely after it ^was made." He then said they have to do this or they'd soon run out of space. He also covers himself by saying "Keeping the tape might be more of an acknowledgement that there was a special interest in this fellow."

Naturally, after the assassination there is no "special interest" in anything relating to the alleged assassin!

and thus ~~Shel~~ ^{Shel} Shyster Meister tells his expectable large audience that the tape no longer exists. His proof is third-calls hearsay, ^{class almost three decades later,} but official.

That tape was in Dallas and from the time it reached the FBI there is certainly a record ^{and when it was there,} of where it at the least was. My belief is that the FBI kept it and hid it in the Dallas office. There it had a metal cabinet in which it kept tapes and pictures ^{hidden from} not shown in the central filing system. ^{or so they would not show on searches,}

There is no reason to believe that the FBI wanted that tape destroyed. That could have hurt the FBI much and laid it open to serious charges. And if the CIA had by any chance insisted on its return, the FBI could have dubbed it easily and rapidly. But with Oswald accused of being the assassin, it is unthinkable that anyone would consider destroying such a tape of what he was up to. ^{after instance of that tape was recorded.}

So, I searched for the records relating to this tape, beginning with Heitman's on going to pick ^{Rudd} the ~~legat~~ agent (and the picture(s) and tape(s) up at Love Field.

Only to find there is no long any copy in any of the files in which copies ^{or if any of these records} might be. ^{should be,}

111A These particular records ^{one} were duplicates of records lost in the enormity of the originals as I received them. I ^{made} these copies for what I call my "subject" file and then return the originals to ^{ed} that the bound folder in which it ^{was} kept, as I got them from the FBI.

That is the file of about six drawers of records in which I know Posner worked when he was here. This doesn't mean that he did the stealing but it does mean, ⁱⁿ the lawyers' phrase he had the ^{motive} means and the opportunity. And at least ^{for over a year} well back into last year ^{nobody} nobody else was in that file. ^{these} Meaning the subject files.

The Heitman file now holds only an unrelated, one-page Secret Service letter.

Even the Rudd, ~~E~~Eldon, file folder itself is gone.

(^{This} ~~That~~ also does not mean that those records had not been stolen earlier.)

Even the file I had for those Mexico City intercepts has every one of the FBI records missing from it. All that remains is two pages copied from the report of the House assassins committee.

Then I remember that I had filed several appeals over the withholding of ~~this~~ cable and its content. My practise with those appeals was to attach copies. So, I looked through the cabinet holding the appeals files and there also those pages are missing. Not even the folder identifying the contents remains.

That led me to check my Jones Printing Company file. It now holds only one of the several FBI reports referred to above, the one Posner ^{cited} ~~published~~, and none of my notes of either interview with Jones in the file.

Remembering Posner's treatment of Carolyn Arnold, which will interest us later, I checked that file. I'd gotten the holograph of the second time the FBI spoke to her. It ^{is} ~~is~~ gone, too.

Posner criticizes ^{Today} ~~Today~~ Summers, not without cause, over his handling of Carolyn Arnold. This holograph at the least raises substantial questions about what Summers did. So, he could have decided to deep-six it several years ^{earlier} ~~ago~~ when he was here.

While one cannot be certain because the back plates to keep file folders in place can move, but I had a large Mexico City file in the subject file. Had. Past tense. And space where it would have been was not closed up. Nonetheless there is this gap and it was not there the last time I was in that file cabinet.

The one thing that is without question is that these records are missing.

But there is no way of knowing when they disappeared or who did take them.

"Nobody had Posner's motive ^{yet} but then there are many people with ample motives for many crimes- that they did not commit.

The only one ^{who had} I can recall ~~and~~ the interest in that Carolyn Arnold holograph other than Posner is Summers.

I am reminded of Posner's acknowledgement to me: "He ^{allowed} ~~allowed~~ me full run of his basement. ...His attitude toward sharing information is refreshing...." (Page 504)

Should I not wonder with whether I can continue to give ~~as~~ others this free and unsupervised access when records that include my own work that cannot be duplicated save from memory is stolen? along with copies of the official records all already deeded to the people in perpetuity by the ~~deep~~ deposit of them all at Hood College, which assures access to all?

Must I not now warn ^{Hood} that it, too, can be robbed? And ^{that} perhaps it had best think of raising money to pay someone to police those who use those records ^{because has been} there being this record of ~~expectable~~ ^{This thievery could have been only} thievery ~~and that was only possible~~ by one to whom favors were extended and who thus repaid thoughtfulness ^{consideration} (and access with ~~out~~ supervision ^{that mark of his family}).

What kind of person goes to the home of an aged, infirm and ill man, accepts hospitality that Posner describes as "gracious", and in his case for several days, has the free run of the place, as he says and is true of all others, takes all of the host's ~~time he wants,~~ ^{dominate him in a book and all things} and ~~steals~~ steals from him? Posner ~~ix~~ and Summers are not alone in having had the opportunity. But whomever it was, can such a person be trusted with anything? Can the word of such a person ever be accepted? Can it be assumed that a person capable of this served his personal interest only?

Does the ~~disappearance~~ stealing of the Mexico City material pinpoint the thief?

If so, from what I quote ^{above} from his book, that points to Posner alone.

^{extra space}

In fairness to Posner, little as he deserves any consideration ^{of any kind,} there was one other person with an interest in what is related to the Douglas Jones files and he without ^{it} any question at all did steal when he was here. Not only is he the only one who had the opportunity, in trying to lie his way out of it he provided proof that he ~~was the thief,~~ ^{and he alone could have been} proof ^{have,} than only the thief could provide, and with that he provided a witness to it!

~~My~~ Richard Waybright was ostensibly working in my files for Livingstone. Livingstone and ^{and} Lifton were and had been feuding, each claiming the other took credit for his work, all of which was that crazy theorizing that confused and misled the people and tended to protect errant officialdom. As my friend Roger Feinman confirmed in an excellent, small-

book length study of Lifton's work and work methods, Lifton is a blackmailed. He also was so boastful of his thievery, he ^{first} laid out in advance of it to Sylvia ^{Meagher} Meagher how he was going to steal an excellent print of the Zapruder film and then he gloated to her how he did it!!

When Feinman published this, Lifton rushed to defend himself to his clique on the CompuServe computer network. Lifton's defense is that he lied to Meagher so what Feinman published - what Lifton himself had written ^{Meagher} her - ought not be believed!

"Don't believe what he says that I said because although I did say it, I am a liar " is typical Liftonian reasoning. To him and to his large following that it an adequate and a proper defense.

Unknown to me the many times Waybright drove over from Baltimore, each time saying he had come to work for Livingstone, Waybright was also working for Lifton. The story that seems credible, knowing both Lifton and Waybright's improper if not also illegal conduct, is that Lifton blackmailed Waybright by telling him that if he did not do what Lifton wanted him to do, he would inform a friend s he said was an assistant to Maryland's ~~district~~ attorney general. ^{W/} Whether or not this ^{is} is how Waybright came to work for Lifton, that he did he confirmed in his own handwriting that I have. It was also confirmed by Livingstone before in his own unique ^{way he} to fell over the edge ^{of} his own insanities.

Waybright ^{me} asked if he could borrow the lengthy analysis I prepared of Lifton's book when it appeared and of the duplication of the records the Military District of Washington provided to Lifton that ^I obtained from the MDW by asking it under FOIA for only the records it provided to him. ^{W/} Waybright's reason was that he could do all that serowing at no cost in Baltimore and he would return those records when he was back again.

Uneasy about any only-copies leaving here ~~but~~ and not then knowing that Livingstone had made a small fortune on his first book, High Treason, I agreed. When Waybright was next here he told me he returned those records. I did not check, not believing it was necessary, and then forgot about the matter.

Then, months later, Livingstone appeared. He asked if he could copy the very records

Harry, " I said, incredulously, "Rich borrowed those records and took them to Baltimore to copy for you without any xeroxing cost. You have them."

"I do not have them," Harry responded. "If I had them would I have driven out here to get them?"

Naturally, he would not have.

Then

Waybright had borrowed to copy for him. I told Livingstone that and he said he never got those copies. A search of the files showed they were not here.

115A
five
> Waybright denied to Livingstone and to me that he had stolen those records. Whether or not Livingstone wanted to know why he had come for them for him and did ~~Not~~ give them to him I do not know. I do know that Livingstone ~~put~~ ^{put} up with much from Waybright because Waybright did many things for him he could not get done any other way. One was to make illegal use of the police computer system to violate the privacy of a number of people ^{and for other uses.} and to locate people ^{for Livingstone.} Another ^{was} to go to Dallas with and for Livingstone and use his police credentials there to investigate for Livingstone.

The Baltimore police internal-affairs ^{unit} ~~was~~ ^{was} aware of ~~the~~ ^{these} misuses of the computer network by February, 1993, because it then asked ^{me} for my knowledge of it. More than a half-year later it had done nothing to Waybright and another Baltimore policeman who ^{also} moonlighted for Livingstone and it had done nothing at all about Livingstone who paid those policemen for wrongful and illegal work, work proscribed under the regulations. It ~~even~~ did nothing when it was given a letter of complaint Livingstone wrote a hospital-
on Baltimore police stationery!

Livingstone's many offenses include representing himself as working with and for ^{and men of} the Baltimore police. It and I have his records in which he says, "I am the law" and That he represents the Baltimore police. (My belief is that in seeking to avoid a public scandal ^{the police} he lays the foundation for ^{the} an even greater scandal of ^{then} its abdication of any responsibility ^{they} ~~is~~ ^{is} had ^{their} of illegalities and of violation of its own regulations and failed to do anything about it.)

When I complained to a friend of Wayright's that he had robbed me and asked that he ^{bring} Waybright to meet with my wife and me when I had to be at The Johns Hopkins Hospital for a consultation, they joined us there for lunch.

Waybright continued to insist that he had returned everything, ^{what he had taken} He even drew a chart on a napkin of where he had refilled it. The place he indicated is where he knew it did not belong and would never be found in any search for it. I said nothing about that when the friend said he would come out ^{on} a day off and save me the trip ~~to~~ ^{to} these

a medical no-no for me.

to and from the cellar and into a search of the lowest file drawer, ~~something I am not~~
to do on doctors' orders.

He did come, he did ~~se~~ search and he did retrieve and show me what he ~~retrieved~~.
In utterly unrelated records he had found one of ^{manilla} two envelopes of MDW records, ~~that~~
those on its part in JFK's funeral. There was a second such envelope, of the MDW's
^{beginning} participation ~~before~~ ^{extending} before Air Force 1 landed and through the autopsy, and that is the
one that hold the relevant information, the one relating to what Lifton's book holds.

~~That is~~ It still missing and nobody other than Waybright ever had it. That he had
it is without question. So also is it beyond question that he did not return it.

^{MDW} Those records and my only copy of the ^{in his story} analysis I ~~had~~ made of Lifton's totally
impossible theory of body-snatching that made him rich and famous were stolen and they
remain stolen.

^{only copy} Lifton more than anyone else wants those proofs of his perpetrating a fraud in
his book. ~~Way~~ Bright did steal them. He did not give them to Livingstone. Livingstone
told another who told me that he believes Waybright stole them for Lifton. And aside from
all the reports I've received of ~~Way~~ Bright working for Lifton, I have his own account
of some of that work, specifically for Lifton, in his own handwriting.

What I had relating to the Jones Printing Company that was of interest to Lifton
is what I learned about the possibility of Lifton's friend ^{Thornley's} involvement. In
the course of investigating Thornley I obtained much information about him, including
a series of his handwritten letters in which - ^{who says a preoccupation to violence makes assassins -} hear this, Gerald Posner, he boasts about
his own acts of violence in New Orleans.

They, too, I no longer have and all Waybright had to do to locate them ^{here} was check
the files under Thornley's name.

I have no reason to believe that Lifton ~~had~~ ^{kept} off Livingstone had any interest at all
in the other records that have been ^{stolen} stolen. Livingstone ~~was~~ ^{was} limited to Lifton and
Lifton's ~~was~~ ^{was} interest in my records on him and perhaps in my missing Thornley records.

Aside from their interests in what was stolen from me, Posner, Livingstone and
Lifton have this in common: they all criticize all others working in the field to
which each claims pre-eminence for a variety of real and imagined offenses, with me the

latter only. ⁹ Each has a record of using the work of others as their own in their books.

Each writes as though deprecating others somehow elevates himself.

None reflects the biblical morality of ^{not} throwing stones ~~only~~ if one is without sin.

~~None~~ ¹⁰ reflects the common-sense wisdom of not throwing stones from a glass house.

And none wrote truthfully and accurately about events in New Orleans, to which we
nor return.